

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/550,943	JACOB, WERNER
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ROBERTA DELISLE	3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Roberta DeLisle (3) John Luce  
 (2) Victor Batson (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 09 February 2009

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4, 7-11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sagady (US 4,136,982).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Compared illustrations of claimed locking ring with prior art of Sagady (US 4,136,982). Applicant will consider further defining the structural details of the locking ring.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.




2-9-09



INVENTION



62 and 68 are supported on  
inner part 54

SAGADY